

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

Jane Turner,

Plaintiff,

v.

Drenda Glanz,

Defendant.

Case No. C06-894RSL

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte*. On June 29, 2006, plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* was granted and plaintiff submitted her "Complaint for Assault and Battery, Libel and Slander, and Malicious Prosecution [sic]" (Dkt. # 3). In this complaint, plaintiff alleges that defendant Drenda Glanz perpetrated each of the wrongs listed in the caption and sets forth these factual allegations: Glanz attempted to enter Turner's apartment without permission, Glanz filed an insurance claim with the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries with defamatory statements about Turner, and that Glanz falsely told the Bainbridge Island Police Department that she did not attempt to enter Turner's apartment without permission. Complaint at ¶ 3, 7, 11.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

1 The Court has reviewed the factual and legal allegations in the complaint under the  
2 standard articulated in Bernhardt v. Los Angeles County, 339 F.3d 920, 925 (9th Cir. 2003)  
3 (“Courts have a duty to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally, including *pro se* motions as well as  
4 complaints.”). The Court finds that plaintiff has failed to allege a cause of action cognizable  
5 under federal law, or otherwise trigger this Court’s jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (original  
6 jurisdiction over federal claims); 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (diversity jurisdiction over diverse parties).  
7 Where a party has clearly stated one cause of action, this Court may not infer another. Bogovich  
8 v. Sandoval, 189 F.3d 999, 1001 (9th Cir. 1999). Where a party fails to state a claim upon  
9 which relief may be granted, this Court is obligated to dismiss the action immediately. 28  
10 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

11 For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff is hereby ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE why this  
12 complaint should not be dismissed. Plaintiff shall, within thirty (30) days of this order, file an  
13 amended complaint which establishes this Court’s jurisdiction. Such a complaint would either  
14 (1) allege a cause of action based on a violation of federal law, or (2) show that the parties are  
15 diverse (e.g., citizens of different states) and that plaintiff is entitled to recover at least \$75,000.  
16 See 28 U.S.C. 1332(a)(1)–(4) (examples of “diverse” citizenship). If an acceptable amended  
17 complaint is not filed within the time proscribed, this action will be dismissed without prejudice.  
18 The Clerk of Court is directed to send a copy of this order to the plaintiff, and to place this  
19 Order to Show Cause on the Court’s calendar for August 16, 2006.

20  
21 DATED this 17th day of July, 2006.

22  
23 

24 Robert S. Lasnik  
25 United States District Judge  
26